

REVIEWING and REFINING **MoSTEP**

Revising the Standards

MACTE Conference
March 23, 2006

J. Mike Lucas

MoSTEP Review Process

- Step 1: Reviewed MoSTEP Annual Reports
- Step 2: Drafted survey instruments data sources
- Step 3: Engaged Fall 2004 MACTE Conference participants in focused discussion based on MoSTEP Work Group's original intentions for the standards/procedures
- Step 4: Revised the survey instruments based on MACTE responses
- Step 5: Distributed surveys to deans, directors or chairs of all educator preparation units and to site team participants

MoSTEP Review Process

Step 6: Participated in MoSTEP Reviews at IHE's

Step 7: Interviewed DESE's Educator Preparation Staff

Step 8: Compiled results of surveys & responses from interviews

Step 9: Presented findings & recommendations to DESE's Educator Preparation Section

Step 10: Amend MoSTEP Standards/Procedures

Data Sources

- **MACTE Focus Group Responses**
- **MoSTEP Effectiveness Survey**
- **Impact of MoSTEP Standards Survey**
- **Site Visit Team Member Survey**
- **Site Visit Observations**
- **Analysis of Annual Reports**
- **Interviews with DESE Personnel**
- **Input from Commissioner of Education and State Board of Education**
- **Statutory Requirements Created Since 1999**

Response Rate for Institutional Surveys

- Surveys were sent to all 37 of Missouri's 4-year Teacher Preparation Institutions
- Total number of respondents to one or both surveys = 16 (43%)

Public Institutions: 5 of 14 (36%)

Private Institutions: 9 of 23 (39%)

Unidentified Institutions: 2 of 37 (5%)

Characteristics of Respondent Institutions

- **State Accreditation Only (MoSTEP):
10 of 16 (62.5%) (56% of 18 possible)**
- **National Accreditation (NCATE or TEAC):
6 of 16 (37.5%) (32% of 19 possible)**
- **Respondents who participated in original
MoSTEP Development Group in 1996:
8 of 16 (50%)**

Revisions to MoSTEP
drafted by
Educator Preparation Section
(based on information from data sources)

MACTE-Nominated Group Convened to Revise Standards

- Carolyn Elphingstone, Jefferson College
- Donna Gardner, William Jewell College
- Hap Hairston, Central Methodist University
- Patrick Henry, Lincoln University
- Evelyn Maxwell, Missouri State University
- Tim Wall, Northwest Missouri State Univ.
- Helene Sherman, Univ. of Missouri - StL
- Becky Widener, Columbia College

Structural Changes to Standards

Proposals:

- Addition of “standard statements” before each set of professional competencies in Standard 1 (school leader, counselor, library media specialist)
- Change of Standard 3 title to “**FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE** (Initial and Advanced) “
- Addition of overarching Statement for Standard 5: Qualifications, Composition, Assignments, And Development Of Professional Education Faculty, And Quality Of Instruction
- Combining of Standard 8 Quality Indicators

DESE Personnel Interview and Site Team Evaluation Responses to Usefulness of Standard 2: Program and Curriculum Design

Standard Statement: “The unit has *high quality professional education programs* derived from a conceptual framework(s) that is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.”

Issue: No definition of “High Quality Program”

Proposal: Addition of defining elements for a “high-quality program” (2.2) to better specify the meaning and intent of the Standard statement:

Results from Impact Survey, Survey of Site Team Members, Interviews with DESE Personnel and State Board Desires

Respondents expressed the importance of assessments and using assessment results for program improvement.

Proposal: Add quality indicators 2.3 and 2.4 to include defining elements of an assessment system and specifications for its use and requiring unit assessment of the impact of its candidates, faculty and programs on the improvement of P-12 education (based on Mean = 3.01 on 4 pt. scale)

Impact survey revealed IHE's impression that review teams focus too much on counting individuals of color rather than applying MoSTEP's broader definition of **diversity**.

Proposals:

- Include elements and influence of diversity in the curriculum of professional programs ([Standard 2](#))
- Broaden context of diverse field and clinical experience placements ([Standard 3](#))
- Attach experience with diversity to expectations for faculty credentials ([Standard 5.1](#))
- Emphasize plan for affecting diversity counts among candidates and faculty ([Standard 4](#) and [Standard 5.2](#))

Surveys Indicated Need to Broaden Range of Acceptable Summative Assessment Types

Impact Survey 4.3 & 4.4.2: Mean = 3.39

Impact Survey 4.4.3: Mean = 2.70

Effectiveness Survey:

10e Portfolio Artifacts (Mean = 2.62)

10f Portfolio Reflections (Mean = 2.67)

Proposal: Revise MoSTEP 4.3 & 4.4 to broaden options for documenting candidate competence while retaining emphasis on multiple forms of assessment data.

Evidence of Unit's Impact on Student Learning

Effectiveness Survey: (Question #9)

“Many national standards organizations (including Title II) are emphasizing evidence of candidates’ “impact on student learning.” To what degree do you believe that MoSTEP should adopt this emphasis?”

– Mean: 3.01 (“agree”) on 4-pt. scale

State Board's Expressed Desire

Proposal: Addition of sub-indicator to 4.4.2 candidate's impact on student learning, or (for non-teaching fields) ability to create supportive learning environments

Institutional Support for Maintaining Assessment System

2004 MACTE Conference Respondents:

100% of MoSTEP-only respondents indicated that they did not have sufficient resources (human or fiscal) to maintain their assessment system.

Proposal: Add to Standard 6 an indicator that addresses institutional support for maintaining an assessment system

Collaboration to Improve P-12 Student Learning

State Board expressed desire for evidence of IHE's collaboration in P-12 schools/student learning

Proposal: Addition to Standard 7 of an indicator regarding unit's collaboration in the improvement of pK-12 student learning

Other Proposed Additions/Clarifications

- 5.5.1 Professional education faculty employ a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of various models and approaches to learning. They model the use of a variety of technology applications and skills appropriate for educational settings to create meaningful learning opportunities for all students.
- 5.5.2 Faculty teaching in the content areas employ instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of their students' modes of learning. They also model the use of technology applications and skills appropriate for educational settings to create meaningful learning opportunities for all students.

Revisions Based on Recent Statutory Requirements

3.6 The unit has a written policy to permit alternative clinical practice for candidates in lieu of conventional student teaching in accordance with state statute and administrative rule. (Chapter 168.400, RSMo; 5 CSR 80-805.040)

Changes Already Implemented in MoSTEP Practices

- Inclusion of initial PRAXIS II Pass Rates Among Program Documentation
- Revisions to the MoSTEP Annual Report attempting to eliminate elements not needed by DESE (Fall 2005)